

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - LOS ANGELES

--○○○--

In Re: ) Case No. 2:12-bk-40267-DS  
PETER EMANUEL KVASSAY, )  
Debtor, ) Chapter 7  
-----X ) Los Angeles, California  
KVASSAY, ) Thursday, November 19, 2015  
Plaintiff, )  
v. ) 2:00 P.M.  
KVASSAY, )  
Defendant. )  
-----X

CONTINUED HEARING RE: [127]  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN LIMINE  
NUMBER 5 FOR SUMMARY  
ADJUDICATION OF THE FACT THAT  
DEFENDANT "STOLE" FROM THE  
TRUST

CONTINUED PRETRIAL CONFERENCE  
RE: [1] ADVERSARY CASE  
2:12-ap-02577. COMPLAINT BY  
ROBERT KVASSAY AGAINST PETER  
EMANUEL KVASSAY, FRAUD AS  
FIDUCIARY, EMBEZZLEMENT,  
LARCEY)), (62  
DISCHARGEABILITY - 523(a),  
FALSE PRETENSES, FALSE  
REPRESENTATION, ACTUAL  
FRAUD)), (65  
(DISCHARGEABILITY - OTHER)),  
(68 (DISCHARGEABILITY -  
523(a)(6), WILLFUL AND  
MALICIOUS INJURY))

Proceedings produced by electronic sound recording;  
transcript produced by transcription service.

1 CONTINUED HEARING RE: [140]  
2 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR  
3 PARTIAL SUMMARY ADJUDICATION  
4 OF LARCENY AND CONVERSION  
5 CLAIMS UNDER 11  
6 U.S.C. §523(a)(4), (6)

7 CONTINUED HEARING RE: [119]  
8 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN LIMINE  
9 NUMBER 4 FOR AUTHENTICATION  
OF DUPLICATE DOCUMENTS

10 CONTINUED HEARING RE: [118]  
11 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN LIMINE  
12 NUMBER 3 - TO DEEM ADMITTED  
13 DOCUMENTS SIGNED BY THE  
14 DEBTOR/DEFENDANT

15 TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS  
16 BEFORE THE HONORABLE DEBORAH SALTZMAN  
17 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

18 APPEARANCES:

19 For the Plaintiff: RICHARD R. CLEMENTS, ESQ.  
20 MATTHEW BROWN, ESQ.  
21 MARK RUSSAKOW, ESQ.  
22 LISA TAN, ESQ.  
23 Russakow Greene & Tan, LLP  
24 800 East Colorado Boulevard  
25 Pasadena, California 91101

26 DIANNA HECK, ESQ.  
27 Law Office of Dianna Heck  
28 28562 Oso Parkway D-324  
29 Rancho Santa Margarita,  
30 California 92688

31 Court Recorder: Gabriela Huerta  
32 U.S. Bankruptcy Court  
33 Central District of California  
34 Edward R. Roybal Federal Building  
35 and Courthouse  
36 255 East Temple Street, Room #1639  
37 Los Angeles, California 90012  
38 (855) 460-9641

1 Court Transcriptionist: Ruth Ann Hager, C.E.T.\*\*D-641  
2 Ben Hyatt Certified Deposition  
Reporters  
3 17835 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 310  
Encino, California 91316

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page

4

1                   LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2015

2                   2:31 P.M.

3                   --oo--

4                   THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Operator. It  
5 is now 2:30. We are back on the record for our 2:00  
6 o'clock hearing. We have been waiting since 2:00 o'clock  
7 for Mr. Stewart, counsel for the defendant. He was  
8 informed obviously at our last hearing that this would be a  
9 telephonic-only hearing and at 2:00 o'clock he actually  
10 called the courtroom saying that he was running late  
11 shortly before 2:00 o'clock and was told that this was a  
12 telephonic hearing and that he was to call into CourtCall  
13 immediately. He apparently hasn't done so, so I think we  
14 will go forward.

15                  Why don't we begin again with appearances and  
16 we'll go from there?

17                  MR. CLEMENTS: Yes, Your Honor. Richard R.  
18 Clements on behalf of plaintiff.

19                  THE COURT: Good afternoon again.

20                  MS. HECK: Dianna Heck -- oh, excuse me. Dianna  
21 Heck appearing on behalf of plaintiff.

22                  THE COURT: Good afternoon again.

23                  MR. BROWN: And Matthew Brown, Mark Russakow and  
24 Lisa Tan on behalf of Robert Kvassay, who's also present on  
25 the phone.

Page

5

1                   THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon.

2                   My intention was to use this obviously as an  
3 opportunity to rule on the pending motion and then to deal  
4 with things at the pretrial conference so we could set a  
5 trial date for all remaining issues to be tried.

6 Unfortunately, I don't think that's going to be possible  
7 without counsel for the defendant. I am in a position,  
8 though, to issue the ruling. Counsel can order a  
9 transcript if he's interested in hearing the detailed  
10 reasoning behind the ruling, but I don't see any reason to  
11 keep counsel waiting any longer and we'll just have to set  
12 an additional pretrial conference at another date to  
13 similar logistical matters.

14                  But in any event, let's just talk first about the  
15 summary judgment motion, which I think is the main motion  
16 that was on calendar. This is the plaintiff's motion for  
17 summary judgment on both the 523(a)(4) larceny claim and  
18 the 523(a)(6) cause of action based on willful and  
19 malicious injury. The contention of the motion is that the  
20 findings of the LA Superior Court in case number BP122477,  
21 this is referred to in the papers as a probate case. Those  
22 findings are preclusive as to both the 523(a)(4) and  
23 523(a)(6) cause of action.

24                  What I want to do, though, is first deal with the  
25 issue raised by the defendant in the papers and at the

Page

6

1 hearing and that is the contention that the state court  
2 judgment is void as a violation of the discharge  
3 injunction.

4                 This argument by the defendant is a real  
5 misunderstanding of the basic concept of bankruptcy law and  
6 that is the discharge and the discharge injunction. Now,  
7 the very Code section cited in the defendant's brief, as  
8 well as read on the record at the hearing by the defendant,  
9 reveal the problem with the defendant's argument.

10                 Section 524(a)(1) provides that a discharge in  
11 the case under this title avoids any judgment at any time  
12 obtained to the extent that such judgment is a  
13 determination of the personal liability of the debtor with  
14 respect to any debt discharged under Section 727 and so on.  
15 Section 524(a)(2) goes on to say that:

16                 "The discharge operates as an injunction against  
17 the commencement or continuation of an action,  
18 employment process or an act to collect, recover or  
19 offset any such debt as the personal liability of the  
20 debtor."

21                 The key notion of Section 524 is that it refers  
22 to a dischargeable debt. A non-dischargeable debt is not  
23 subject to the discharge injunction. This is basic Ninth  
24 Circuit law. The *Barre* case I think is one of the main  
25 decisions. The *DS* case in the Eleventh Circuit also is a

Page

7

1 very useful discussion that the discharge injunction only  
2 applies to dischargeable debt.

3 Now, the language in Section 523 of the  
4 Bankruptcy Code is also quite clear as to what the  
5 discharge and the discharge injunction by extension applies  
6 to. Section 523(a) provides that a discharge under Section  
7 727 of this title does not discharge an individual debtor  
8 from any debt and then goes on to enumerate the variety of  
9 debts that are not discharged and that, of course, includes  
10 steps that are not dischargeable under Section 523(a) (4)  
11 and 523(a) (6).

12 Now, in this case there was a timely action under  
13 Section 523 to determine the liability -- the  
14 dischargeability of the debt owed to the plaintiff for the  
15 discharge and the discharge injunction do not apply to  
16 those debts. So the argument that an action in state court  
17 that was properly brought, that was properly continued  
18 after seeking and receiving relief from the automatic stay,  
19 that somehow this action violates the discharge injunction  
20 again is a basic misunderstanding of bankruptcy law.

21 Now, this point is made even more clear in the  
22 discharge order for the debtor in this case. And if we  
23 look at docket number 36 in this case, this is the order  
24 discharging the debtor, the order states:

25 "The debtor is granted a discharge under

Page

8

1           Section 727, Title XI, United State Code, the  
2           Bankruptcy Code."

3           The order goes on to say in all capitals, "See  
4 the back of this order for exception." You turn to the  
5 back of the discharge order and we see a heading that says,  
6 "Debts that are not discharged." And line (h):

7           "The type of debt that is not discharged includes  
8 debts of the Bankruptcy Court under Section 523 of the  
9 Bankruptcy Code or other applicable law specifically  
10 has decided or will decide in this bankruptcy case are  
11 not discharged."

12          There is no question that the debts in this case  
13 that are subject to the dischargeability proceeding were  
14 not discharged by the 2013 discharge of the debtor. That's  
15 why we're here. And it's the defendant's argument were  
16 correct, pretty much every action under Section 523 of the  
17 Bankruptcy Code would be useless, because in most cases the  
18 discharge is granted before the ultimate determination of a  
19 pending dischargeability action.

20          Now, I want to also make clear, as I alluded to  
21 before, that the probate case is entirely proper as it  
22 relates to the bankruptcy case. The plaintiff received  
23 relief from the automatic stay to pursue the action and the  
24 timing of the discharge before the conclusion of the state  
25 law action is irrelevant because there was a pending

Page

9

1 Section 523 dischargeability action. The discharge did not  
2 apply to the debt at issue in the state court proceeding  
3 and there could be no violation of the discharge  
4 injunction.

5 Now, there's a very similar case that was  
6 recently decided by the Ninth Circuit Bankruptcy Appellate  
7 Panel. It's a published decision, but because the case is  
8 so recent, I don't have a citation in the Bankruptcy  
9 Reporter, but the case is *Lakhany*. That's spelled L-A-K-H-  
10 A-N-Y, versus *Khan*, K-H-A-N, and this is BAP case number  
11 14-1586.

12 And in the *Lakhany* case, there was a very similar  
13 situation to what we have in this case and the defendant  
14 there argues, as the defendant does here and I will quote  
15 here:

16 "Defendant contends that the exclusive  
17 jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court can determine  
18 dischargeability somehow bars establishing the  
19 predicate facts for that determination in a state  
20 court or presumably any other non-bankruptcy forum.  
21 This is a fundamental misunderstanding. Bankruptcy  
22 courts regularly make non-dischargeability  
23 determinations via issue preclusion on facts  
24 determined elsewhere."

25 And the Bankruptcy Appellate Panel goes on to

Page

10

1 cite *Grogan v. Garner*, the seminal Supreme Court case, on  
2 the applicability of issue preclusion and a  
3 dischargeability action. And there, as here, I think it is  
4 clear that:

5 "The defendant has a fundamental misunderstanding  
6 of the extent of the discharge and the discharge  
7 injunction as it relates to a debt that is the subject  
8 of a pending dischargeability proceeding and is also  
9 subject to a pending state law cause of action that  
10 was properly brought and properly continued through an  
11 action for relief from the automatic stay. The  
12 judgment of the state court is not void and this court  
13 may examine that judgment for whether collateral  
14 estoppel applies."

15 So now I'm going to turn to the second set of  
16 arguments that were made in the papers whether collateral  
17 estoppel applies with respect to the state court judgment.  
18 Now, there are several factors that need to be met when the  
19 Bankruptcy Court is to determine whether states -- whether  
20 collateral estoppel applies as to the findings of the state  
21 court proceeding. And California law, which is what is to  
22 be applied here, outline several elements that must be  
23 found.

24 First, the issue to be precluded must be  
25 identical to the issue decided in a prior proceeding;

Page

11

1 second, the issue must have been actually litigated in the  
2 prior proceeding; third, it must have been necessarily  
3 decided in the prior proceeding; fourth, the decision in  
4 the prior proceeding must be final and on the merits; and  
5 finally, the party against whom preclusion is sought must  
6 be the same as or in privy with the party to the former  
7 proceeding.

8 Now, here we have an assertion from the plaintiff  
9 that the state court's findings should be given preclusive  
10 effect as to both larceny and conversion and that this  
11 satisfies both the Section 523(a)(4) cause of action for  
12 larceny and also the 523(a)(6) cause of action with respect  
13 to willful and malicious injury.

14 I simply don't see in the state court findings,  
15 findings adequate to be a preclusive effect on either of  
16 these causes of action. Conversion and larceny were not  
17 the issues before the Probate Court and the findings of the  
18 Probate Court don't establish -- don't support findings  
19 with respect to all of the elements of larceny or  
20 conversion that would allow this Court to give them  
21 preclusive effect.

22 And in particular, I want to point out that the  
23 findings that are pointed issues by the plaintiff and the  
24 court says, however, take judicial notice of the entire  
25 statement of decision by the state court and I have

Page

12

1 certainly reviewed all of the findings made by the state  
2 court, the findings in that decision -- first of all, the  
3 ones that were highlighted and, in fact, really most of the  
4 findings are with respect to intentional acts not by this  
5 defendant but by Richard Kvassay. And the findings that  
6 are specific with respect to Peter Kvassay don't establish  
7 any element of intent, which is required both from  
8 523(a)(4) and 523(a)(6). They simply use language that  
9 Richard used here and that doesn't establish they required  
10 an intent either for larceny or conversion.

11 So ultimately, I do not see that the Probate  
12 Court statement of decision is adequate to be given  
13 preclusive effect, both for the 523(a)(4) claim or for the  
14 523(a)(6) claim. So for that reason, the motion is denied  
15 so that the court will enter an order denying that motion.

16 We also have two pending motions *in limine*.  
17 Well, we have three pending motions *in limine*. The first,  
18 which is matter #1.00 on our calendar, that is the motion  
19 that is essentially identical to the summary judgment  
20 motion and that actually should have been taken off  
21 calendar at some point. It just wasn't, so that motion is  
22 denied.

23 We also have a motion *in limine* number three and  
24 motion *in limine* number four. And I really think that both  
25 of those motions are efforts to address potential

Page

13

1 evidentiary objections that could be made by the defendant  
2 at trial. So I don't think that they're appropriate for  
3 motions *in limine*. If there is an objection made at trial  
4 with respect to the various documents certainly there will  
5 be argument at trial and the Court will make a  
6 determination at that point.

7                 And then with respect to the various statements  
8 that were made in the defendant's admitted facts in one of  
9 the earlier pretrial documents filed by the defendants, it  
10 just doesn't appear to me that there's any basis under Rule  
11 403 of the Federal Rules of Evidence or really any other  
12 basis to exclude any evidence on these issues, you know, at  
13 this time.

14                 At a future date at trial the plaintiff certainly  
15 could ask the Court to take judicial notice of any  
16 documents that the defendant has filed with the Court to  
17 the extent that at trial the defendant attempts to make any  
18 different statements. So certainly those documents are  
19 available for impeachment, but at this point it doesn't  
20 seem that this is appropriate for a motion *in limine*, so  
21 that motion is also denied.

22                 We were supposed to have a pretrial conference  
23 today, but with one party I don't think that that's  
24 possible. Mr. Clements, I would like to set a pretrial  
25 conference relatively soon so that we can select a trial

Page

14

1 date. There's going to be several days needed for this  
2 trial. Do you have any -- my last available date for a  
3 pretrial conference would be December 15th. If that is a  
4 good date for you, we can do it then. Otherwise, we would  
5 be into January. January 5th, January 12th would be the  
6 next two available dates. Do you have a preference?

7 MR. CLEMENTS: If I may check, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Sure. Go ahead.

9 MR. CLEMENTS: With my non-digital calendar. At  
10 what time, Your Honor?

11 THE COURT: Let's see. It would be 2:00 o'clock.  
12 My suggestion is to do one of the January dates so that  
13 then Mr. Stewart can obtain a transcript of this hearing.

14 MR. CLEMENTS: All right. If the Court please,  
15 may I step in the other room to get my other non-digital  
16 calendar for next year?

17 THE COURT: Sure, that's fine.

18 MR. CLEMENTS: Just a moment, please.

19 (Pause)

20 What date in January, Your Honor?

21 THE COURT: I have January 5th at 2:00 o'clock or  
22 January 12th.

23 MR. CLEMENTS: Either is all right.

24 THE COURT: All right. Why don't we go ahead  
25 with January 12th and that will be 2:00 o'clock. And at

Page

15

1 that point I think what we are doing is selecting a trial  
2 date. Before that I will have a pretrial order that I will  
3 issue that will be sent to the parties.

4 One other item, Mr. Clements, I wanted to make  
5 you aware of, is that there was a motion for an order to  
6 show. I believe it was filed in the main case yesterday.

7 Have you seen that motion?

8 MR. CLEMENTS: Your Honor, I have seen that  
9 motion and I left a message with your clerk that -- on  
10 behalf of Mr. Robert Kvassay and the plaintiff trust that  
11 they would like to file an application in opposition to --

12 THE COURT: There's no need to do that. I will  
13 issue an order denying the request for issuance of an order  
14 to show cause for the same reason that I stated on the  
15 record at the beginning of my comments today. There is  
16 clearly no violation of the discharge injunction and the  
17 motion, like much of the opposition in the motion for  
18 summary judgment, reflects a real misunderstanding of the  
19 discharge and the discharge injunction, so I will issue an  
20 order without any need for further briefing or argument.

21 MR. CLEMENTS: Did the Court wish an order on the  
22 ruling that it is making today?

23 THE COURT: I will prepare those orders.

24 MR. CLEMENTS: Okay. And, Your Honor, the one in  
25 *limine* motion is simply to use duplicates of documents that

Page

16

1 are in custody of the Superior Court. That's the --

2 THE COURT: Yeah, and I do understand that.

3 There was not a timely declaration in support of that  
4 motion. There was some late filed documentation, so that  
5 was one problem with the motion. And also again, it really  
6 seems that the motion is premature because it's essentially  
7 anticipating an evidentiary objection to the use of copies  
8 when there is no objection pending at this point. So I  
9 think that that's an issue that's going to have to be  
10 resolved at trial.

11 MR. CLEMENTS: All right. I would advise the  
12 Court that at the time of the prior pretrial the trial has  
13 been calendared for October the 13th. And so the  
14 plaintiff's declaration and additional declarations have  
15 already been filed with the Court. I believe Mr. Stewart  
16 has filed evidentiary objections to those. The defendant's  
17 declaration has been already filed and the day for the  
18 plaintiff to file evidentiary objections was actually the  
19 day of the hearing. And the Court vacated the trial so  
20 those evidentiary objections --

21 THE COURT: All right.

22 MR. CLEMENTS: -- have been filed.

23 THE COURT: All right. I will --

24 MR. CLEMENTS: So with --

25 THE COURT: I will review those and I will be in

Page

17

1 a position to rule at the trial -- at the start of trial.

2 MR. CLEMENTS: All right.

3 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I think that's it  
4 for today. Mr. Clements, if you would please notice out  
5 the January 12th, 2:00 o'clock pretrial conference I would  
6 appreciate that and the Court will prepare the order on the  
7 matters on calendar today.

8 MR. CLEMENTS: We will profile the notice, Your  
9 Honor.

10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

11 MR. BROWN: Your Honor -- Your Honor?

12 THE COURT: Yes.

13 MR. BROWN: Oh, this is Matthew Brown, one of the  
14 attorneys for Robert Kvassay. Since the Court is going to  
15 be preparing the orders on the matters that were at court  
16 today I just wanted to inquire will there be specific  
17 findings in that order that, one, the state court judgment  
18 is not void; and two, that there was no violation of the  
19 discharge order in obtaining that judgment?

20 THE COURT: The order will have -- will first  
21 reference my oral comments at the hearing and will probably  
22 have a summary ruling to that effect.

23 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

24 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

25 (End at 2:51 a.m.)

Page

18

1

\* \* \* \* \*

2

I certify that the foregoing is a correct  
transcript from the electronic sound recording of the  
proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

5

6

7

Date: 11/30/2015

8

RUTH ANN HAGER, C.E.T.\*\*D-641

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25